



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,773	09/26/2003	Richard Sita	MATP-39902US1	9714
23122 RATNERPRESTIA P O BOX 980 VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980	7590 01/23/2007		EXAMINER TRAN, TRANG U	
			ART UNIT 2622	PAPER NUMBER

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/672,773

Applicant(s)

SITA, RICHARD

Examiner

Trang U. Tran

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Gall et al (US Patent No. 4,897,799).

In considering claim 1, Le Gall et al discloses all the claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed sensing information provided by a display device having a display format, the sensed information being indicative of the display format of the display device is met by the original device 12 which send a raster display (native format) to the receiving device 14 (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 3, lines 18-42), and 2) the claimed determining the display format of the display device responsive to the sensed information is met by the raster display which can be characterized by pixel aspect ratio, the resolution, the color mode, the number of bits per pixel (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 3, line 27 to col. 4, line 30).

However, Le Gall et al does not specifically discloses the newly added limitation that "**sensing information contained in a display device**".

Whether the sensing information and the display device are build integrally or separately is considered to be obvious to one of ordinary in the art (see *In re Larson*, 144 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965) and *Nerwin v. Erlichman*, 168 USPQ 177) and shifting the location of sensing information into the display device is also considered to be obvious to one of ordinary in the art (see *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70) (CCPA 1950)).

In considering claim 2, the claimed wherein the display device includes a register containing information indicative of the display format and wherein the sensing step comprises at least the step of: reading the register to obtain the information indicative of the display format is met by the formatting box 14 which processes a header 20 in the form of Fig. 2 (col. 3, line 27 to col. 4, line 30).

In considering claim 4, the claimed wherein the register includes an aspect ratio and resolution of the display device and wherein the determining step comprises at least the step of: determining the display format for the display device based on the aspect ratio and resolution read from the register is met by the raster display which can be characterized by pixel aspect ratio, the resolution, the color mode, the number of bits per pixel (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 3, line 27 to col. 4, line 30).

In considering claim 5, the claimed wherein the reading step comprises at least the step of: reading the register over at least one video signal line coupled to the display device, the at least one video signal line configured as a two-way data path is met by the conversion of one raster type of video RGB format to another (Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 15-42).

Claims 6-7 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 1-2, respectively.

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4.

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4.

Claim 11 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4.

Claim 12 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 5.

In considering claim 13, Le Gall et al discloses all the claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed a video monitor including: a display device is met by the original device 12 (display device) which send a raster display (native format) to the receiving device 14 (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 3, lines 18-42), 2) the claimed a digital register integral with the display device, the digital register including data indicative of at least one characteristic of the display device is met by the formatting box 14 which processes a header 20 in the form of Fig. 2 (col. 3, line 27 to col. 4, line 30), and 3) the claimed a data path coupled to the digital register to provide the data indicative of the at least one characteristic of the display device to an output port is met by the data path of conversion unit 10 (Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 15-42).

However, Le Gall et al does not specifically disclose the newly added limitation “a **digital register integral with the display device**”.

Whether the digital register and the display device are build integrally or separately is considered to be obvious to one of ordinary in the art (see In re Larson, 144 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965) and Nerwin v. Erlichman, 168 USPQ 177) and shifting the

Art Unit: 2622

location of the digital register into the display device is also considered to be obvious to one of ordinary in the art (see *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70) (CCPA 1950)).

In considering claim 14, the claimed wherein the data path is a video signal path configured as a two-way data path is met by the data path of conversion unit 10 which is a two-way path (Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 15-42).

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4.

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4.

In considering claim 18, discloses all the claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed a video display system including: a video display having a register integral with the video display including data indicative of at least one characteristic of the video display device is met by the original device 12 (display device) which send a raster display (native format) to the receiving device 14 (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 3, lines 18-42), and 2) the claimed a decoder configured to read the data in the register of the video display and determine the at least one characteristic of the video display from the data is met by the conversion unit which first decodes the coded raster format, and then do the conversion proceeds (Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 15-42).

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4.

Claim 20 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4.

4. Claims 3 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Gal et al (US Patent No. 4,897,799) in view of Michaud (US Patent No. 6,057,874).

In considering claim 3, Le Gall et al discloses all the limitations of the instant invention as discussed in claims 1 and 2 above except for providing the claimed

Art Unit: 2622

wherein the register includes a manufacturer and model number of the display device and wherein the determining step comprises at least the step of: automatically determining the display format for the display device based on the manufacturer and model number read from the register.

Michaud teaches, in the CATV communication system, that the headend has a memory for storing information related to all VCRs including manufacturers 104, model numbers 106 and the corresponding VCR control codes 108, 110 for setting the VCR, the television and the settop terminal (col. 1, lines 25-40 and col. 3, lines 16-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the setting the VCR, the television and the settop terminal as taught by Michaud into La Gall et al's system in order to efficiently utilizing memory in the setting.

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2622


shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trang U. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7358. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM, Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

January 20, 2007



Trang U. Tran
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622